arXiv:math/9311207v1 [math.LO] 18 Nov 1993

Extensions of the Erdős-Rado Theorem

by

James E. Baumgartner[1], András Hajnal[2], and Stevo Todorčević[3]

Dedicated to Eric Milner on the occasion of his third coming of age

0. Statement of results. We find here some extensions of the Erdős-Rado Theorem that answer some longstanding problems. Ordinary partition relations for cardinal numbers are fairly well understood (see [EHMR]), but for ordinal numbers much has been open, and much remains open. For example, any proof of the simplest version of the Erdős-Rado Theorem seems to yield

$$\text{For any regular cardinal } \kappa, \text{ if } \mu < \kappa \text{ then } (2^{<\kappa})^+ \to (\kappa+1)^2_\mu,$$

but to replace $\kappa+1$ by $\kappa+2$ seems quite a nontrivial problem. In this paper we will prove that if κ is regular and uncountable, then

Theorem 3.1. $\forall k<\omega\ \forall \xi < \log\kappa\ (2^{<\kappa})^+ \to (\kappa+\xi)^2_k$.

Theorem 4.1. $\forall n,k<\omega\ (2^{<\kappa})^+ \to (\rho, (\kappa+n)_k)^2$, *where* $\rho = \kappa^{\omega+2}+1$.

Theorem 5.1. $\forall n<\omega\ (2^{<\kappa})^+\cdot\omega \to (\kappa\cdot n)^2_2$.

The actual version of 5.1 is slightly stronger. Here $\log\kappa$ is the least cardinal μ such that $2^\mu \geq \kappa$, the exponentiation in 4.1 is ordinal exponentiation, and the products in 5.1 represent ordinal multiplication. For $\kappa=\omega$, 3.1, 4.1, and 5.1 all follow from the known result $\omega_1 \to (\alpha)^2_k$ for all $\alpha<\omega_1$ and all $k<\omega$ (see), so the uncountable case is the interesting one.

The proofs make use of elementary substructures of structures of the form $(H(\mu), \in)$ where $H(\mu)$ is the set of all sets hereditarily of cardinality $<\mu$, and of ideals on ordinals generated from such elementary substructures. It is possible to recast our arguments in

---

[1] The preparation of this paper was partially supported by National Science Foundation grant number DMS–8906946.

[2] Research supported by Hungarian National Science Foundation OTKA grant 1908.

[3] Research supported by the Science Fund of Serbia grant number 0401A

such a way as to fit them under the heading of ramification arguments but we choose not to do so, both because the proofs remain clearer this way, and because we believe that this may generally be a better approach to ramification arguments.

The proof of 4.1 also uses a metamathematical trick seen in [BH] for countable ordinals. Our approach is to prove 4.1 in a generic extension of the universe obtained by κ-closed forcing, and then to argue that it must therefore be true.

Several open problems remain. The simplest versions are whether any of the following are provable from GCH:

$$\omega_3 \to (\omega_2 + 2)^2_\omega$$

$$\omega_3 \to (\omega_2 + \omega_1, \omega_2 + \omega)^2$$

$$\omega_2 \to (\omega_1^{\omega+2} + 2, \omega_1 + 2)^2$$

or whether the following is provable from CH:

$$\omega_3 \to (\omega_1 + \omega)^2_3.$$

1. Terminology. Our partition calculus notation is standard. If x is a set and λ is a cardinal then $[x]^\lambda = \{\, y \subseteq x : |y| = \lambda \,\}$, $[x]^{<\lambda} = \bigcup\{\, [x]^\kappa : \kappa < \lambda \,\}$, and $[x]^{\leq\lambda} = [x]^{<\lambda^+}$. Usually, but not always, such a λ is finite. The ordinary (ordinal) partition relation $\alpha \to (\beta)^2_\mu$ means that $\forall f : [\alpha]^2 \to \mu\ \exists X \subseteq \alpha\ X$ has order type β and is homogeneous for f, i.e., f is constant on $[X]^2$. Here α and β may be ordinals; μ is always taken to be a cardinal. If $f(x) = i$ for all $x \in [X]^2$ then we say X is *i-homogeneous.* The unbalanced relation

$$\lambda \to (\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{n-1})^2$$

means that $\forall f : [\lambda]^2 \to n\ \exists X \subseteq \lambda\ \exists i < n\ X$ has order type γ_i and is i-homogeneous. We abbreviate

$$\lambda \to (\alpha, \beta, \beta, \beta, \ldots, \beta)^2$$

by $\lambda \to (\alpha, (\beta)_n)^2$ if there are n occurrences of β.

If κ and λ are cardinals, then $\lambda^{<\kappa} = \sum\{\, \lambda^\mu : \mu < \kappa \,\}$. Clearly $2^{<\kappa} \geq \kappa$. If κ is regular then $\kappa^{<\kappa} = 2^{<\kappa}$.

If $(N, \in)$ is an elementary substructure of $(H(\lambda), \in)$ (i.e., $(N, \in) \prec (H(\lambda), \in)$) then we often abbreviate this by $N \prec H(\lambda)$. The $\in$-relation is always understood. Suppose κ is regular, $N \prec H(\kappa^{++})$, $|N| = \kappa$ and $\alpha = N \cap \kappa^+ < \kappa^+$. Then we may define an ideal I on α as $\{\, X \subseteq \alpha : \exists A \in N \ \alpha \notin A \text{ and } X \subseteq N \,\}$. Clearly I contains all bounded subsets of α. If in addition $2^{<\kappa} = \kappa$ then it is quite possible that $[N]^{<\kappa} \subseteq N$, and we generally work with sets N with this property. Note in that case that I is κ-closed, i.e., if $\mu < \kappa$ and $X_i \in I$ for $i < \mu$, then $\bigcup\{\, X_i : i < \mu \,\} \in I$. This follows from the fact that if $A_i \in N$ for each $i < \mu$ and $\alpha \notin A_i$, then $\langle\, A_i : i < \mu \,\rangle \in N$ since $[N]^{<\kappa} \subseteq N$ so $A = \bigcup\{\, A_i : i < \mu \,\} \in N$ and $\alpha \notin A$.

If I is an ideal on α then $I^+ = \{\, X \subseteq \alpha : X \notin I \,\}$ and $I^* = \{\, X \subseteq \alpha : \alpha - X \in I \,\}$. Note that if I is not proper, then $I^+ = 0$ and $I^* = I$. If $I(\alpha, \beta)$ is an ideal then we write $I^+(\alpha, \beta)$ instead of $I(\alpha, \beta)^+$.

If $N \prec H(\kappa^{++})$ as above, $S \in N$ and $\alpha \in S$, then $S \cap \kappa^+$ must be cofinal in κ^+. If not, an upper bound is definable from S and κ^+, both of which lie in N ($\kappa^+ \in N$ since it is the largest cardinal in N), so the upper bound must be $< \alpha$, which is impossible. It follows that $S \cap \alpha$ is cofinal in α. In fact, $S \cap \kappa^+$ is actually stationary in κ^+, since otherwise there would be closed unbounded $C \in N$ with $S \cap C = 0$. But then $C \cap \alpha$ is unbounded in α so $\alpha \in C$, which is impossible.

We often use variations of the ideal I to produce large homogeneous sets for a partition function $f \in N$. Such arguments can also be made using ramification ideas. A very good introduction to the ideas we plan to use is in Section 2, where a simple version of the Erdős-Rado Theorem is proved with these techniques.

In Section 4 we will use the notions of stationary and closed unbounded subsets of $[X]^\kappa$, where X is a set such that $|X| > \kappa^+$. We assume the reader is familiar with these notions.

2. The Erdős-Rado Theorem. In this section we present a slightly nonstandard proof of the Erdős-Rado Theorem, and an associated result, using elementary substructures. Our goal is to prepare the way for an extension of the Erdős-Rado Theorem to be proved in the next section.

Theorem 2.1. *(Erdős-Rado [ER]) Let* κ *be a regular cardinal and let* $\lambda = (2^{<\kappa})^+$*. Then* $\lambda \to (\kappa + 1)^2_\mu$ *for all* $\mu < \kappa$*.*

Proof. Fix $f : [\lambda]^2 \to \mu < \kappa$. Choose $N \prec H(\lambda^+)$ such that $f \in N$, $|N| = 2^{<\kappa}$, $[N]^{<\kappa} \subseteq N$ and $N \cap \lambda = \alpha < \lambda$. (Note that this implies $\operatorname{cf} \alpha = \kappa$. If $\operatorname{cf} \alpha < \kappa$ then some cofinal subset x of α would be an element of N, and $\alpha = \bigcup x$ so $\alpha \in N$, contradiction.) Let $I_\alpha = \{ X \subseteq \alpha : \exists A \in N \ \alpha \notin A \text{ and } X \subseteq A \}$. Then I_α is a κ-complete ideal on α since $[N]^{<\kappa} \subseteq N$.

For $i < \mu$ let $H_i = \{ \beta < \alpha : f\{\beta, \alpha\} = i \}$. Then $\bigcup \{ H_i : i < \mu \} = \alpha$ so for some i $H_i \in I^+_\alpha$.

Claim. *If* $H_i \in I^+_\alpha$*,* $X \subseteq H_i$ *and* $X \in I^+_\alpha$ *then* $\exists Y \subseteq X$ Y *is* i*-homogeneous of order type* κ*.*

This will suffice since then $Y \cup \{\alpha\}$ is i-homogeneous of type $\kappa + 1$.

It will suffice to show

Lemma 2.2. *If* $X \subseteq H_i$*,* $X \in I^+_\alpha$*,* $x \subseteq X$*,* $|x| < \kappa$ *and* x *is* i*-homogeneous, then* $\exists \beta \in X$ $\beta > \sup x$ *and* $x \cup \{\beta\}$ *is* i*-homogeneous.*

Proof. Let $Z = \{ \gamma < \lambda : \forall \delta \in x f\{\delta, \gamma\} = i \}$. Then $Z \in N$ and $\alpha \in Z$ so $\alpha - Z \in I_\alpha$. Since $X \in I^+_\alpha$ we have $X \cap Z \in I^+_\alpha$ as well. Now choose $\beta \in X \cap Z$, $\beta > \sup x$.

Using the same methods we can do a little better.

Theorem 2.3. *As in Theorem 2.1, let* κ *be regular,* $\lambda = (2^{<\kappa})^+$*,* $\mu < \kappa$ *and* $f : [\lambda]^2 \to \mu$*. Then* $\exists A \subseteq \lambda$ $\exists i < \mu$ A *is* i*-homogeneous and either* $|A| = \lambda$ *and* $i = 0$ *or else* A *has type* $\kappa + 1$ *and* $i > 0$*. (In short notation* $\lambda \to (\lambda, (\kappa + 1)_{\mu - 1})^2$*.)*

Proof. We use the notation of the previous proof. If $H_i \in I^+_\alpha$ for some $i > 0$ we are done, so assume $H_i \in I_\alpha$ for all $i > 0$. Then $\bigcup \{ H_i : i > 0 \} \in I_\alpha$ so for some $X \in N$ we have $\alpha \in X$ and $X \cap \alpha \subseteq H_0$. If in N we define $Y = \{ \beta \in X : \forall \gamma \in X \cap \beta \ f\{\gamma, \beta\} = 0 \}$, then $\alpha \in Y$. Hence $|Y| = \lambda$ and is clearly 0-homogeneous.

Remark. Theorem 2.3 is a well known result of Erdős, Dushnik and Miller. See [DM], for example. To get the rest of the Erdős-Rado Theorem with this approach (i.e., the version for partitions of n-element sets) simply proceed via end-homogeneous sets, an approach which is itself highly adaptable—and well known—in the context of elementary substructures. Details are left to the reader.

3. A balanced extension of the Erdős-Rado Theorem.

In this section we seek an improvement of the Erdős-Rado Theorem, Theorem 2.1. This will require a clearer analysis of the ideals I_α defined in Section 2.

Recall that $\log\kappa$ is the least cardinal μ such that $2^\mu \geq \kappa$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let κ be a regular uncountable cardinal, and let $\lambda = (2^{<\kappa})^+$. Then $\forall k < \omega$ $\forall \xi < \log\kappa \;\; \lambda \to (\kappa + \xi)^2_k$.*

Some parts of this theorem are already known. In unpublished work, Hajnal proved Theorem 3.1 for $\kappa = \omega_1$ and $k = 2$ about thirty years ago. Shelah proved Theorem 3.1 for the case $k = 2$ in [Sh1, §6].

The rest of this section will be devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Fix $f : [\lambda]^2 \to k$, and let $\langle N_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be a continuous sequence of elementary substructures of $H(\lambda^+)$ such that $f \in N_0$, $|N_\alpha| = 2^{<\kappa}$, $N_\alpha \in N_{\alpha+1}$ and $[N_\alpha]^{<\kappa} \subseteq N_{\alpha+1}$. We call a sequence continuous if each limit point is the union of the preceding elements. We may assume that $\{\, \alpha : N_\alpha \cap \lambda = \alpha \,\}$ is closed and unbounded in λ. Note that if $\alpha \in S_0 = \{\, \alpha : N_\alpha \cap \lambda = \alpha \text{ and } \operatorname{cf}\alpha = \kappa \,\}$ then $[N_\alpha]^{<\kappa} \subseteq N_\alpha$.

If $\alpha \in S_0$ then let $I_\alpha = \{\, X \subseteq \alpha : \exists A \in N_\alpha \; \alpha \notin A \text{ and } X \subseteq A \,\}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $S \subseteq S_0$ be stationary. Then there is closed unbounded $C \subseteq \lambda$ such that $\forall \alpha \in C \cap S \;\; S \cap \alpha \in I^+_\alpha$.*

We refer to α as a *reflection point* of S.

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Let $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be a continuous sequence of elementary substructures of $H(\lambda^+)$ such that $N_\alpha \subseteq M_\alpha$, $|M_\alpha| = 2^{<\kappa}$ and $S \in M_0$. Let $N = \bigcup\{\, N_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \,\}$ and let $C = \{\, \alpha : M_\alpha \cap N = N_\alpha \,\}$. If $\alpha \in C \cap S$ then $S \cap \alpha \in I^+_\alpha$ since otherwise there is $A \in N_\alpha \subseteq M_\alpha$ such that $S \subseteq A$ and $\alpha \notin A$, which is impossible. [Note: we really only know that $S \cap \alpha \subseteq A \cap \alpha$, but since $S, A \in M_\alpha$ we must have $M_\alpha \models S \subseteq A$ and since $M_\alpha \prec H(\lambda^+)$, it is true that $S \subseteq A$. We will leave such remarks tacit in future.]

For $i < k$ let $f_i(\alpha) = \{\, \beta < \alpha : f\{\beta, \alpha\} = i \,\}$.

Next, if σ is a sequence of length n of elements of k we define an ideal $I(\alpha, \sigma)$ for $\alpha \in S_n$, where $S_{n+1} = \{\, \alpha \in S_n : \alpha \text{ is a limit point of } S_n \,\}$. The definition is by induction on $n = \text{length}(\sigma)$. Let $I(\alpha, \langle\rangle) = I_\alpha$. If $\sigma = \tau^\frown\langle i\rangle$ then put

$$X \in I(\alpha, \sigma) \quad \text{iff} \quad \{\, \beta < \alpha : X \cap f_i(\alpha) \cap \beta \in I^+(\beta, \tau) \,\} \in I_\alpha.$$

Notice that some of the $I(\alpha, \sigma)$ may not be proper. As part of the proof of the Erdős-Rado Theorem we essentially made the easy observation that there exists i such that $I(\alpha, \langle i\rangle)$ is proper.

Lemma 3.3. *We always have* $I_\alpha \subseteq I(\alpha, \sigma)$.

Proof. Once again we proceed by induction on length(σ). Suppose $\sigma = \tau^\frown\langle i\rangle$. We may assume $I(\alpha, \sigma)$ is proper. Let $X \in I_\alpha$. then $\exists A \in N_\alpha$ $X \subseteq A \cap \alpha$ and $\alpha \notin A$. We may as well assume $X = A \cap \alpha$. Since α is limit and $A \in N_\alpha$ we know $\exists \gamma < \alpha$ $A \in N_\gamma$. Suppose $\beta < \alpha$, $\gamma < \beta$, and $A \cap \beta \in I^+(\beta, \tau)$. Then by inductive hypothesis $A \cap \beta \in I^+_\beta$ so $\beta \in A$. Thus

$$\{\, \beta < \alpha : (A \cap \alpha) \cap f_i(\alpha) \cap \beta \in I^+(\beta, \tau) \,\} \subseteq \{\, \beta < \alpha : A \cap \beta \in I^+(\beta, \tau) \,\} \subseteq A \cap \alpha \in I_\alpha,$$

so $A \cap \alpha \in I(\alpha, \sigma)$ as desired.

Now we extend an observation made in the proof of the Erdős-Rado Theorem.

Lemma 3.4. *If* $X \subseteq \alpha$ *and* $X \in I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$ *then* $\forall j \in \text{range}\,\sigma$ $\exists W \subseteq X$ W *is* j*-homogeneous and* $|W| = \kappa$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on length(σ). We may assume $\sigma = \tau^\frown\langle i\rangle$. If $j \in \text{range}(\tau)$ then we may apply the inductive hypothesis to $X \cap \beta \in I^+(\beta, \tau)$ for some $\beta < \alpha$. So suppose $j = i$. As in Lemma 2.2 let us argue that if $x \subseteq X$, $|x| < \kappa$ and $x \cup \{\alpha\}$ is i-homogeneous then $\exists \xi \in X$ $\xi > \sup x$ and $x \cup \{\xi\} \cup \{\alpha\}$ is i-homogeneous. Let $A = \{\, \beta : x \cup \{\beta\} \text{ is } i\text{-homogeneous} \,\}$. Then $A \in N_\alpha$ and $\alpha \in A$ so $a - A \in I_\alpha$. By Lemma 3.3 $\alpha - A \in I(\alpha, \sigma)$, so $A \cap X \in I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$. Hence there is $\beta < \alpha$, $\beta > \sup x$, such that $A \cap X \cap f_i(\alpha) \cap \beta \in I^+(\beta, \tau)$. Now just choose $\xi \in A \cap X \cap f_i(\alpha)$ with $\xi > \sup x$.

Given an ordinal ρ and a finite sequence σ of elements of k we define what it means for $x \subseteq \lambda$ to be (ρ, σ)-*good*. x is $(\rho, \langle\rangle)$-good iff x is a singleton. If $\sigma = \tau^\frown\langle i\rangle$ then x is (ρ, σ)-good iff $x = \bigcup\{\, x_\xi : \xi < \rho \,\}$ where each x_ξ is (ρ, τ)-good, $\xi < \eta < \rho$ implies $\sup x_\xi < \inf x_\eta$, and whenever $\xi < \eta < \rho$, $\gamma \in x_\xi$ and $\delta \in x_\eta$ then $f\{\gamma, \delta\} = i$. Note that any (ρ, σ)-good set must have order type ρ^n where $n = \text{length}(\sigma)$.

Lemma 3.5. *If x is (ρ, σ)-good then $\forall i \in \operatorname{range} \sigma\ \exists y \subseteq x\ y$ is i-homogeneous and has order type ρ.*

Proof. Easy by an induction on length(σ).

Lemma 3.6. *If $X \in I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$ then $\forall \rho < \kappa\ \exists x \subseteq X\ x$ is (ρ, σ)-good.*

Proof. Say $\sigma = \tau^\frown\langle i\rangle$. We construct $x = \bigcup\{\, x_\xi : \xi < \rho \,\} \subseteq X \cap f_i(\alpha)$. By induction on ξ we obtain (ρ, τ)-good $x_\xi \subseteq X \cap f_i(\alpha)$. Suppose x_η has been obtained for $\eta < \xi$. Since $\rho < \kappa$ we know $x_\eta \in N_\alpha$ for each $\eta < \xi$ and hence $\langle\, x_\eta : \eta < \xi \,\rangle \in N_\alpha$. Thus $A = \{\, \beta : \forall \eta < \xi\ \forall \gamma \in x_\eta\ f\{\gamma, \beta\} = i \,\} \in N_\alpha$. Moreover, $\alpha \in A \in I^*_\alpha \subseteq I^*(\alpha, \sigma)$, so $X \cap A \in I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$. Find $\beta < \alpha$ such that $X \cap A \cap f_i(\alpha) \cap \beta \in I^+(\beta, \tau)$ and choose (ρ, τ)-good $x_\xi \subseteq X \cap A \cap f_i(\alpha) \cap \beta$. We may assume β is large enough so that we may choose x_ξ with $\sup x_\eta < \min x_\xi$ for all $\eta < \xi$. The rest is easy.

Recall that an *indecomposable* ordinal is an ordinal power of ω. An indecomposable ordinal is characterized by the property that whenever $\rho = A \cup B$, either A or B has order type ρ.

Lemma 3.7. *If ρ is indecomposable, $x \subseteq \lambda$ is (ρ, σ)-good, $m < \omega$ and $x = \bigcup\{\, t_j : j < m \,\}$ then $\exists j\ \exists y \subseteq t_j\ y$ is (ρ, σ)-good.*

Proof. Let $\sigma = \tau^\frown\langle i\rangle$ and let $\langle\, x_\xi : \xi < \rho \,\rangle$ witness (ρ, σ)-goodness of x. By inductive hypothesis for each $\xi < \rho$ there is $j(\xi) < m$ and $y_\xi \subseteq x_\xi \cap t_{j(\xi)}$ such that y_ξ is (ρ, τ)-good (this is trivial if $\tau = \langle\rangle$). Since ρ is indecomposable there is j such that $\{\, \xi : j(\xi) = j \,\}$ has order type ρ. Let $y = \bigcup\{\, y_\xi : j(\xi) = j \,\}$. Then $y \subseteq t_j$ and y is (ρ, σ)-good.

If σ is a finite sequence of elements of k let $f_\sigma(\alpha) = \bigcup\{\, f_i(\alpha) : i \in \operatorname{range} \sigma \,\}$.

Recall that we defined $S_{n+1} = \{\, \alpha \in S_n : \alpha \text{ is a limit point of } S_n \,\}$. Thus $S_\omega =$

$\bigcap\{\, S_n : n < \omega \,\}$ differs from S_0 by a nonstationary set, and $I(\alpha, \sigma)$ is defined for all σ whenever $\alpha \in S_\omega$.

If $T \subseteq S_\omega$ is stationary and $\alpha \in T$, let $\Sigma(\alpha, T) = \{\, \sigma : \sigma$ is one-to-one, length$(\sigma) \geq 1$, and $T \cap \alpha \in I^+(\alpha, \sigma) \,\}$. Note that if α is a reflection point of T then $\Sigma(\alpha, T) \neq 0$.

Lemma 3.8. *There is stationary $S \subseteq S_\omega$ and Σ such that for all stationary $T \subseteq S$ there is a closed unbounded set C such that $\forall \alpha \in T \cap C \ \Sigma(\alpha, T) = \Sigma$.*

Proof. Note that if $\alpha \in T \subseteq S$ then $\Sigma(\alpha, T) \subseteq \Sigma(\alpha, S)$. Choose descending sequences

$$S_\omega = T_0 \supseteq T_1 \supseteq T_2 \supseteq \dots \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma_0 \supseteq \Sigma_1 \supseteq \Sigma_2 \supseteq \dots$$

such that $\forall n \ \forall \alpha \in T_{n+1} \ \Sigma(\alpha, T_n) = \Sigma_n$, the T_n are stationary and Σ_{n+1} is a proper subset of Σ_n. Since each Σ_n is finite this process must end after finitely many steps. Let S and Σ be the final elements of each sequence.

Clearly $\Sigma \neq 0$. Choose $\sigma \in \Sigma$ maximal with respect to inclusion.

Lemma 3.9. *There are $\alpha \in S$ and stationary $T \subseteq S$ such that $\forall \beta \in T \ \alpha - f_\sigma(\beta) \in I(\alpha, \sigma)$.*

Proof. Suppose the Lemma is false. Then for each $\alpha \in S$ there is closed unbounded C_α such that $\forall \beta \in C_\alpha \cap S \ \alpha - f_\sigma(\beta) \in I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$.

Let $C = \{\, \beta : \forall \alpha \in \beta \cap S \ \beta \in C_\alpha \,\}$, the diagonal intersection of the C_α. Then C is closed unbounded. Let $\alpha \in S$ be a reflection point of $C \cap S$ with $\sigma \in \Sigma(\alpha, S)$. For all $\beta \in C \cap S \cap \alpha$ there must be $i \notin$ range(σ) such that $\beta \cap f_i(\alpha) \in I^+(\beta, \sigma)$. Fix $i < k$ such that $\{\, \beta \in C \cap S \cap \alpha : \beta \cap f_i(\alpha) \in I^+(\beta, \sigma) \,\} \in I^+_\alpha$. But now clearly if $\tau = \sigma ^\frown \langle i \rangle$ then $S \cap \alpha \in I^+(\alpha, \tau)$, contradicting maximality of σ.

Now we are ready to put all this material together to complete the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Fix an indecomposable ordinal $\rho < \log \kappa$. It will suffice to find a homogeneous set of order type $\kappa + \rho$. Let α and T be as in Lemma 3.9. Choose $\beta > \alpha$ such that $\Sigma(\beta, T) = \Sigma$. Since $T \cap \beta \in I^+(\beta, \sigma)$ there is $x \subseteq T$ that is (ρ, σ)-good. We may assume $\min x > \alpha$. Also, since $I(\alpha, \sigma)$ is κ-complete we know $F = \bigcup\{\, \alpha - f_\sigma(\beta) : \beta \in x \,\} \in I(\alpha, \sigma)$. For each

$\gamma \in \alpha - F$ define $g_\gamma : x \to \mathrm{range}(\sigma)$ by $g_\gamma(\beta) = f\{\gamma, \beta\}$. Since $|x| < \log \kappa$ there is g such that $\{\,\gamma : g_\gamma = g\,\} \in I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$. Also, by Lemma 3.7 $\exists i$ $g^{-1}(i)$ is (ρ, σ)-good.

But now by Lemma 3.4 $\exists W \subseteq \{\,\gamma : g_\gamma = g\,\}$ such that W is i-homogeneous, and by Lemma 3.5 we may find $y \subseteq g^{-1}(i)$ such that y is i-homogeneous. Also, if $\gamma \in W$ and $\beta \in y$ than $f\{\gamma, \beta\} = g_\gamma(\beta) = g(\beta) = i$ so $W \cup y$ is i-homogeneous of order type $\kappa + \rho$, and the proof is complete.

4. An unbalanced extension of the Erdős-Rado Theorem.

It is natural to ask if Theorem 3.1 can be improved in the same way that Theorem 2.1 was improved to Theorem 2.3. For example, is it true under CH that $\omega_2 \to (\omega_2, \omega_1 + 2)^2$? Hajnal showed in [Ha] that if GCH holds and κ is regular, then $\kappa^+ \not\to (\kappa^+, \kappa + 2)^2$, and Todorčević has shown in unpublished work that this remains the case when κ is singular. Thus the best we could hope to prove under CH would be $\omega_2 \to (\alpha, \omega_1 + 2)^2$ for all $\alpha < \omega_2$. In this section we will prove (a generalization of) an improvement of part of this.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose κ is regular and $\lambda = (2^{<\kappa})^+$. Then $\lambda \to (\rho, (\kappa + n)_k)^2$ for all $n, k < \omega$, where $\rho = \kappa^{\omega+2} + 1$.*

Here $\kappa^{\omega+2}$ represents ordinal exponentiation. Recall that the partition relation means that if $f : [\lambda]^2 \to k + 1$, then either there is a 0-homogeneous set of order type ρ or else there is an i-homogeneous set of type $\kappa + n$ for some $i > 0$.

The rest of this section will be devoted to the proof of Theorem 4.1. The strategy of the proof is to derive Theorem 4.1 from the auxiliary assumption $Q(\kappa)$, which asserts that $2^{<\kappa} = \kappa$ and in addition that

$$(*) \qquad \forall \langle\, f_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa^+ \,\rangle \subseteq {}^\kappa\kappa \ \exists g \in {}^\kappa\kappa \ \forall \alpha \ \exists \eta < \kappa \ \forall \xi > \eta \ f_\alpha(\xi) < g(\xi).$$

Then, rather as in [BH], we observe that the assumption $Q(\kappa)$ is unnecessary, and therefore that Theorem 4.1 holds in ZFC.

Let us deal with this latter observation first.

Let P_0 be the natural κ-closed ordering for making $2^{<\kappa} = \kappa$. Then in V^{P_0} we have $\lambda = \kappa^+$. Working in V^{P_0} and using a standard iterated forcing argument (as in [Ba]) we can force (*) to be true via a partial ordering P_1 that is κ-closed and has the λ-chain condition. Let $P = P_0 * P_1$. Then P is κ-closed and in V^P $\lambda = \kappa^+$ and $Q(\kappa)$ holds. Note that in V^P we will have $2^\kappa > \kappa^+$ (since for one thing that is implied by (*)).

Assuming we have proved Theorem 4.1 under the assumption $Q(\kappa)$ we may assume it holds in V^P. Assume $f : [\lambda]^2 \to k+1$, where $f \in V$. Then in V^P there is $A \subseteq \lambda$ such that either (a) A is 0-homogeneous of type ρ or (b) A is i-homogeneous of type $\kappa + n$, where $i > 0$. Suppose (a) holds. Note that $\kappa^{\omega+2} + 1$ is the same whether computed in V or in V^P. Let $h : \kappa \to \rho$ be a bijection with $h \in V$. In V^P fix an order-isomorphism $j : \rho \to A$. Now, working in V, find a decreasing sequence $\langle\, p_\xi : \xi < \kappa \,\rangle$ of elements of P and a sequence $\langle\, \alpha_\xi : \xi < \kappa \,\rangle$ of elements of λ such that $\forall \xi \; p_\xi \Vdash j(h(\xi)) = \alpha_\xi$. This is easy to do by induction on ξ, using the fact that P is κ-closed. But now it is clear that $\{\, \alpha_\xi : \xi < \kappa \,\} \in V$ has order type ρ and is 0-homogeneous. Case (b) may be handled the same way.

From now on, assume $Q(\kappa)$ holds (so $\lambda = \kappa^+$).

We begin with a couple of observations about order types. The only use of $Q(\kappa)$ will be in Corollary 4.3 below.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $n < \omega$, $n \geq 1$, $\alpha < \kappa^+$, and assume α has a cofinal subset of type κ^n. Then for every $f : \kappa \to \kappa$ there is a set $A(f, n, \alpha)$ of order type κ^n cofinal in α such that*

(i) if A is cofinal in α of type κ^n then $\exists f \; A \subseteq A(f, n, \alpha)$

(ii) $\forall f_1, f_2$ if $\forall \xi < \kappa \; f_1(\xi) \leq f_2(\xi)$ then $A(f_1, n, \alpha) \subseteq A(f_2, n, \alpha)$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on n. Suppose $n = 1$. Let $\langle\, \alpha_\xi : \xi < \kappa \,\rangle$ be an increasing, continuous sequence cofinal in α with $\alpha_0 = 0$. Let $A_\xi = \alpha_{\xi+1} - \alpha_\xi$ and let $h_\xi : \kappa \to A_\xi$ be onto. Define $A(f, n, \alpha) = \bigcup \{\, h_\xi “f(\xi) : \xi < \kappa \,\}$. It is easy to see that this works.

Now suppose $n > 1$. Let $\langle\, \alpha_\xi : \xi < \kappa \,\rangle$ be as above. If $\alpha_\xi < \beta \leq \alpha_{\xi+1}$ then for $1 \leq i < n$ let $A'(f, i, \beta) = A(f, i, \beta) \cap (\alpha_{\alpha+1} - \alpha_\xi)$ if $A(f, i, \beta)$ is defined; let $A'(f, i, \beta) = \{\beta\}$ otherwise. Let $A(f, 0, \beta) = \{\beta\}$. Now let $f : \kappa \to \kappa$. We must define $A(f, n, \alpha)$. We may regard f as being defined on $\kappa \times \kappa$, i.e., $f : \kappa \times \kappa \to \kappa$, and we define f_ξ by $f_\xi(\eta) = f(\xi, \eta)$ for $\xi, \eta < \kappa$. Let $h : \kappa \to \alpha$ be a bijection. Now let

$$A(f, n, \alpha) = A(f_0, 1, \alpha) \cup \bigcup \{\, A'(f_\xi, i, h(\xi)) : h(\xi) \in A(f_0, 1, \alpha), i < n \,\}.$$

Since $A(f_0, 1, \alpha)$ has type κ, it is clear that $\bigcup\{\, A'(f_\xi, i, h(\xi)) : h(\xi) \in A(f_0, 1, \alpha) \cap (\alpha_{\eta+1} - \alpha_\eta) \,\}$ has type $< \kappa^n$ for fixed η. Thus $A(f_0, 1, \alpha)$ has type at most κ^n.

It is clear that condition (ii) is satisfied. Let us check (i). Fix $A \subseteq \alpha$ cofinal of type κ^n. For $\eta < \kappa$ let $A_\eta = A \cap (\alpha_{\eta+1} - \alpha_\eta)$. Then A_η has type $< \kappa^n$ so there is a family F_η such that $|F_\eta| < \kappa$, $A_\eta = \bigcup F_\eta$, every $B \in F_\eta$ has type κ^i for some $i < n$ (possibly $i = 0$), and if $B, C \in F_\eta$ and $B \neq C$ then $\sup B < \inf C$ or $\sup C < \inf B$. Let $H_\eta = \{\, \sup B : B \in F_\eta \,\}$. Now choose $f : \kappa \times \kappa \to \kappa$ so that $\bigcup\{\, H_\eta : \eta < \kappa \,\} \subseteq A(f_0, 1, \alpha)$ and whenever $B \in F_\eta$, B has type κ^i for $i > 0$, and $\sup B = \beta = h(\xi)$, then $B \subseteq A(f_\xi, i, \beta)$. But now it is clear that $A \subseteq A(f, n, \alpha)$.

There may be special circumstances in which the $A(f, n, \alpha)$ as defined above have order type $< \kappa^n$. This defect may be remedied by choosing a fixed set of order type κ^n cofinal in α and adjoining its elements to every $A(f, n, \alpha)$.

Corollary 4.3. *($Q(\kappa)$) Let $\alpha < \kappa^+$ and let A_γ, $\gamma < \kappa^+$, be a sequence of sets of order type κ^n cofinal in α, where $1 \leq n \leq \omega$. Then we may write $\kappa^+ = \bigcup\{\, X_\xi : \xi < \kappa \,\}$ where $\bigcup\{\, A_\gamma : \gamma \in X_\xi \,\}$ has order type κ^n for each ξ.*

Proof. First suppose $n < \omega$. For each γ choose $f_\gamma : \kappa \to \kappa$ such that $A_\gamma \subseteq A(f_\gamma, n, \alpha)$. Use $Q(\kappa)$ to find $f : \kappa \to \kappa$ such that $\forall\gamma\ \exists\xi_\gamma\ \forall\eta > \xi_\gamma\ f_\gamma(\eta) < f(\eta)$. Thus there is $s_\gamma : \xi_\gamma \to \kappa$ such that if $g_\gamma = s_\gamma \cup f|(\kappa - \xi_\gamma)$ then $\forall\eta\ f_\gamma(\eta) < g_\gamma(\eta)$. By $\kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa$ there are only κ functions s_γ so we may write $\kappa^+ = \bigcup\{\, X_\xi : \xi < \kappa \,\}$ where if $\gamma, \delta \in X_\xi$ then $s_\gamma = s_\delta$, so $g_\gamma = g_\delta$. But then

$$\bigcup\{\, A_\gamma : \gamma \in X_\xi \,\} \subseteq \bigcup\{\, A(f_\gamma, n, \alpha) : \gamma \in X_\xi \,\} \subseteq A(g_{\gamma_0}, n, \alpha)$$

by Lemma 4.2(ii) where γ_0 is any member of X_ξ.

Now suppose $n = \omega$. For each $\gamma < \kappa^+$ let $g_\gamma(0) = 0$ and if $1 \leq m < \omega$ let $g_\gamma(m)$ be the supremum of the first κ^m elements of A_γ and let $A^m_\gamma = A_\gamma \cap [g_\gamma(m-1), g_\gamma(m))$. Since $\kappa^\omega = \kappa$ we may write $\kappa^+ = \bigcup\{\, Y_\xi : \xi < \kappa \,\}$ where for each $\gamma, \delta \in Y_\xi$ we have $g_\gamma = g_\delta$. And now by the earlier case, for each m we may write $Y_\xi = \bigcup\{\, Y^m_{\xi\eta} : \eta < \kappa \,\}$, where $\bigcup\{\, A^m_\gamma : \gamma \in Y^m_{\xi\eta} \,\}$ has order type κ^m for each ξ and η. For each γ let $h_\gamma(m) = (\xi, \eta)$ if $\gamma \in Y^m_{\xi\eta}$. Finally put $\kappa^+ = \bigcup\{\, X_\xi : \xi < \kappa \,\}$ where for $\gamma, \delta \in X_\xi$ we have $h_\gamma = h_\delta$. It is easy to check that this works.

This is the only use of $Q(\kappa)$ that we need.

For the main proof let us fix a partition function $f : [\lambda]^2 \to k+1$, and assume that there is no i-homogeneous set of type $\kappa + n$, where $i > 0$. We must find a 0-homogeneous set of type ρ.

If $H(\lambda^+)$ is the collection of sets hereditarily of cardinality $\leq \lambda$, then $f \in H(\lambda^+)$. Let $S = \{\, N : N \prec H(\lambda^+),\ |N| = \kappa,\ N \cap \lambda \in \lambda,\ f \in N, \text{ and } [N]^{<\kappa} \subseteq N \,\}$. Then S is a stationary subset of $[H(\lambda^+)]^\kappa$.

Define $\pi : S \to \lambda$ by $\pi(N) = N \cap \lambda$. If $T \subseteq S$ is stationary then let $J_T = \{\, X \subseteq \lambda : \pi^{-1}(X) \cap T \text{ is nonstationary} \,\}$. It is easy to see that J_T is a normal ideal on λ.

Claim 4.4. *Let $\xi < \omega + 2$. Then*

(a) If $T \subseteq S$ is stationary, then there is a set C closed and unbounded in $[H(\lambda^+)]^\kappa$ such that for all $N \in C \cap T$, if $A \in N$ and $\pi(N) \in A$ then there is $x \in N$ such that $x \subseteq A \cap \pi(T)$, x is of order type κ^ξ, and $x \cup \{\pi(N)\}$ is 0-homogeneous.

(b) If $T \subseteq S$ is stationary then there is stationary $U \subseteq T$ and $x \subseteq \pi(T)$ such that x is 0-homogeneous of type κ^ξ and $\forall \alpha \in x\ \forall \beta \in \pi(U)\ f\{\alpha, \beta\} = 0$.

Let us observe that Claim 4.4(a) for $\xi = \omega + 1$ will complete the proof. Fix $N \in C \cap S$. By induction on $\gamma < \kappa$ we define $A_\gamma \in N$ with $\pi(N) \in A_\gamma$ and $x_\gamma \subseteq A_\gamma$ such that x_γ has order type $\kappa^{\omega+1}$ and $x_\gamma \cup \{\pi(n)\}$ is 0-homogeneous. Let A_0 be arbitrary and choose x_0 as in 4.4(a). Suppose A_γ, x_γ have been determined for $\gamma < \delta$. Since $N \in S$ we know $[N]^{<\kappa} \subseteq N$ so $\langle\, x_\gamma : \gamma < \delta \,\rangle \in N$ Thus

$$A_\delta = \left\{ \alpha : \bigcup \{\, x_\gamma : \gamma < \delta \,\} \cup \{\alpha\} \text{ is 0-homogeneous and } \sup \bigcup \{\, x_\gamma : \gamma < \delta \,\} < \alpha \right\} \in N$$

and $\pi(N) \in A_\delta$. Choose $x_\delta \subseteq A_\delta$ as in 4.4(a). This completes the construction. And now $\bigcup \{\, x_\gamma : \gamma < \kappa \,\} \cup \{\pi(N)\}$ is 0-homogeneous and has order type $\kappa^{\omega+1} \cdot \kappa + 1 = \kappa^{\omega+2} + 1 = \rho$, as desired.

Thus we may devote the rest of the section to Claim 4.4. The proof is by induction on ξ.

Let us begin the induction by showing that (b) holds for $\xi = 0$. If there is a $\alpha \in \pi(T)$ such that $X_\alpha = \{\, \beta : f\{\alpha, \beta\} > 0 \,\} \in J_T^+$, then let $x = \{\alpha\}$ and $U = T \cap \pi^{-1} X_\alpha$. If not, then the diagonal intersection $X = \{\, \beta : \forall \alpha < \beta\ \beta \notin X_\alpha \,\}$ belongs to J_T^+, hence has cardinality λ. But now by Theorem 3.1 there is an i-homogeneous set of type $\kappa + n$ for some $i > 0$, contrary to hypothesis.

Next we show (b) implies (a). If (a) is false, then there is stationary $S' \subseteq S$ such that the assertion in (a) fails for all $N \in S'$. By normality of the nonstationary ideal on $[H(\lambda^+)]^\kappa$ there is a single set A and stationary $T \subseteq S'$ such that A is a counterexample to (a) for all $N \in T$. Since $\pi(N) \in A$ for $N \in T$ we have $\pi(T) \subseteq A$. Let x and U be as in (b). Then $x \subseteq \pi(T) \subseteq A \cap \pi(S')$ and x is of type κ^ξ. Since $x \in H(\lambda^+)$ there must be $N \in U$ with $x \in N$. Moreover $x \cup \{\pi(N)\}$ is 0-homogeneous, so A is not in fact a counterexample for N, contradiction.

We now concentrate on showing that (a) for ξ implies (b) for $\xi + 1$, provided $\xi \leq \omega$.

Let T be as in (b), let C be as in (a), and let $\langle\, N_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \,\rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of elements of C with $[N_\alpha]^{<\kappa} \subseteq N_{\alpha+1}$. Let $N_\lambda = \bigcup\{\, N_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \,\}$. We may assume that for all $N \in T$, if $\pi(N) = \alpha$ then $N \cap N_\lambda = N_\alpha$. (If $(N \cap N_\lambda) - N_{\pi(N)} \neq 0$ for stationarily many N, then for stationarily many N there is a common element of $(N \cap N_\lambda) - N_{\pi(N)}$, and this is impossible.) We also assume that if $N \in T$ and $N \cap N_\lambda = N_\alpha$, then $N_\alpha \cap \lambda = \alpha$.

Let Σ_0 be the set of all one-to-one sequences σ of elements of $k+1$ such that $\sigma(0) = 0$. For each $\alpha \in \pi(C \cap T)$ and each $\sigma \in \Sigma_0$ we will define an ideal $I(\alpha, \sigma)$ on α. Each $I(\alpha, \sigma)$ will contain all bounded subsets of α but will not necessarily be closed under countable unions.

First suppose $\sigma = \langle 0 \rangle$. Choose $N \in T \cap C$ with $\pi(N) = \alpha$. Let $\langle\, A_\gamma : \gamma < \kappa \rangle$ enumerate $\{\, A \in N : \alpha \in A \,\}$. We define $\langle\, x_\gamma : \gamma < \kappa \,\rangle$ by induction on γ so that $x_\gamma \in N$, x_γ has type κ^ξ and $x_\gamma \cup \{\alpha\}$ is 0-homogeneous. Suppose x_γ, $\gamma < \delta$, has been obtained. Let

$$A = \bigcap\{\, A_\gamma : \gamma < \delta \,\} \cap \Big\{\, \beta : \beta > \sup\{\, x_\gamma : \gamma < \delta \,\} \text{ and } \forall \gamma < \delta\ \forall \beta' \in x_\gamma\ f\{\beta, \beta'\} = 0 \,\Big\}.$$

Note that $A \in N$ since it is definable from $\langle\, A_\gamma : \gamma < \delta \,\rangle$ and $\langle\, x_\gamma : \gamma < \delta \,\rangle$, both of which are in N, and clearly $\alpha \in A$. By 4.4(a) choose $x_\delta \in N$, 0-homogeneous of type κ^ξ, such that $x_\delta \subseteq A \cap \pi(T)$. Thus $\bar{x}(\alpha) = \bigcup\{\, x_\gamma : \gamma < \kappa \,\}$ is 0-homogenous of type $\kappa^{\xi+1}$, and is cofinal in α since for any $\beta < \alpha$ $\lambda - \beta = A_\gamma$ for some γ. Let $I(\alpha, \langle 0\rangle) = \{\, X \subseteq \alpha : X \cap \bar{x}(\alpha)$ has type $< \kappa^{\xi+1} \,\}$.

Now suppose $\tau \in \Sigma_0$ and $\sigma = \tau^\frown\langle i\rangle$. Let I_α be the ideal on α generated by $\{\, A \cap \alpha : A \in N_\alpha, \alpha \notin A \,\}$, as in the previous section. Recall that $f_i(\alpha) = \{\, \beta < \alpha : f\{\beta, \alpha\} = i \,\}$. For $X \subseteq \alpha$, put $X \in I(\alpha, \sigma)$ iff $\{\, \beta < \alpha : X \cap f_i(\alpha) \cap \beta \in I^+(\beta, \tau) \,\} \in I_\alpha$.

Next we prove analogues of Lemmas 3.3, 3.4, and 3.9.

Lemma 4.5. *$I_\alpha \subseteq I(\alpha, \sigma)$ for $\alpha \in \pi(C \cap T)$, $\sigma \in \Sigma_0$.*

Proof. Let $X \in I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$. If $\sigma = \langle 0\rangle$, then by construction $X \cap A \neq 0$ for all $A \in N_\alpha$ with $\alpha \in A$. Thus $X \in I^+_\alpha$. Suppose $\sigma = \tau^\frown\langle i\rangle$, where $\tau \in \Sigma_0$. Let $A \in N_\alpha$, $\alpha \in A$. Since α is limit $\exists\gamma < \alpha$ $A \in N_\gamma$. Choose β such that $\gamma < \beta < \alpha$, $\beta \in A$, and $X \cap \beta \in I^+(\beta, \tau)$. By inductive hypothesis $X \cap \beta \in I^+_\beta$, so $X \cap \beta \cap A \neq 0$. Thus $X \cap A \neq 0$ so $X \in I^+_\alpha$.

Lemma 4.6. *If $X \in I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$, then for all $j \in \operatorname{range}\sigma$, if $j > 0$ then X contains a j-homogeneous set of type κ.*

Proof. We proceed by induction. Say $\sigma = \tau^\frown\langle i\rangle$ where $\tau \in \Sigma_0$. The induction will handle the case $j \in \operatorname{range}\tau$. It will suffice to show, as in Section 3, that if $x \cup \{\alpha\}$ is i-homogeneous and $|x| < \kappa$ then $\exists\beta \in X - x$ $x \cup \{\beta, \alpha\}$ is i-homogeneous. Let $A = \{\, \gamma : x \cup \{\gamma\}$ is i-homogeneous$\,\}$. Then $A \in N_\alpha$ and $\alpha \in A$. Since $X \in I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$ there is $\gamma \in A$ such that $X \cap f_i(\alpha) \cap \gamma \in I^+(\gamma, \tau)$. We may choose γ large enough that $A \in N_\gamma$ and $\gamma > \sup x$. Thus $X \cap f_i(\alpha) \cap \gamma \cap A \neq 0$ and we may choose $\beta \in X \cap f_i(\alpha) \cap \gamma \cap A$, $\beta > \sup x$.

For $\beta < \lambda$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma_0$, let $f_\sigma(\beta) = \bigcup\{\, f_i(\beta) : i \in \operatorname{range}\sigma \,\}$.

Lemma 4.7. *There are $\sigma \in \Sigma_0$, $\alpha \in \pi(C \cap T)$, and stationary $T' \subseteq T$ such that $\alpha \in I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$ (i.e., $I(\alpha, \sigma)$ is proper) and $\forall\beta \in \pi(T')$ $\alpha - f_\sigma(\beta) \in I(\alpha, \sigma)$.*

Proof. For $\alpha \in \pi(C \cap T)$ we know $\pi(T) \in I^+(\alpha, \langle 0\rangle)$. Choose $\sigma_\alpha \in \Sigma_0$ maximal with respect to inclusion such that $\pi(T) \in I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$, and let $U \subseteq C \cap T$ be stationary such that $\forall\alpha \in \pi(U)$ $\sigma_\alpha = \sigma$.

Suppose the Lemma is false. Then for each $\alpha \in \pi(U)$ there is $C_\alpha \in J^*_U$ such that $\forall\beta \in C_\alpha$ $\alpha - f_\sigma(\beta) \in I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$. (Recall that $J_U = \{\, X \subseteq \lambda : \pi^{-1}(X) \cap U$ is stationary$\,\}$.)

Since J_U is normal, the set $C_\lambda = \{\, \beta : \forall\alpha < \beta \ \beta \in C_\alpha \,\} \in J_U^*$ also. By Lemma 3.2 there is closed unbounded $D \subseteq \lambda$ such that $\forall\alpha \in D \cap \pi(U) \ \ \pi(U) \cap \alpha \in I_\alpha^+$. Fix $\alpha \in D \cap C_\lambda \cap \pi(U)$.

If $\beta < \alpha$ and $\beta \in \pi(U)$ then $\alpha \in C_\beta$ so there is i, $i \notin \operatorname{range}\sigma$, such that $f_i(\alpha) \cap \beta \in I^+(\beta, \sigma)$. Since k is finite we may fix i such that $\{\, \beta < \alpha : \beta \in \pi(U)$ and $f_i(\alpha) \cap \beta \in I^+(\beta, \sigma) \,\} \in I_\alpha^+$. But this means that $I(\alpha, \sigma^\frown\langle i \rangle)$ is proper contrary to the assumption about the maximality of σ.

One more lemma will allow us to complete this part of the proof of Claim 4.4.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $\alpha < \lambda$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma_0$ be arbitrary. If $X \in I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$, $Y \in I(\alpha, \sigma)$ and $Y \subseteq X$, then $\exists\beta \leq \alpha \ \bar{x}(\beta) \cap X$ has type $\kappa^{\xi+1}$ and $Y \cap \bar{x}(\beta)$ has type $< \kappa^{\xi+1}$.*

Proof. If $\sigma = \langle 0 \rangle$ this is clear. Just take $\beta = \alpha$. Suppose $\sigma = \tau^\frown\langle i \rangle$ for $\tau \in \Sigma_0$. Then we can find $\beta < \alpha$ such that $X \cap f_i(\alpha) \cap \beta \in I^+(\beta, \tau)$ and $Y \cap \beta \in I(\beta, \tau)$, so we are done by inductive hypothesis.

Finally, let α, σ and T' be as in Lemma 4.7. For $\beta \in \pi(T')$ let $g(\beta) = \bigcup\{\, f_i(\beta) \cap \alpha : i \in \operatorname{range}\sigma, i > 0 \,\}$. Let $F \subseteq \pi(T')$ be maximal such that $\{\, \cap\{\, g(\beta) : \beta \in x \,\} : x \in [F]^{<\omega} \,\} \subseteq I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$. (It is possible that $F = 0$.)

First, suppose $|F| = \lambda$. Let G be an ultrafilter on α such that $\{\, g(\beta) : \beta \in F \,\} \subseteq G \subseteq I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$. Thus for each $\beta \in F$ there is i_β such that $f_{i_\beta}(\beta) \cap \alpha \in G$. Find i so that $F' = \{\, \beta \in F : i_\beta = i \,\}$ has cardinality λ. We may assume we are proving Theorem 4.1 by induction on k, so by $\lambda \to (\lambda, \kappa)^2$, which follows from Theorem 2.3, we may assume there is $x \subseteq F'$ i-homogeneous of cardinality n. But now the set $\bigcap\{\, f_i(\beta) \cap \alpha : \beta \in x \,\}$ belongs to $I^+(\alpha, \sigma)$ so by Lemma 4.6 must contain an i-homogeneous set H of type κ. And now $H \cup x$ is i-homogeneous of type $\kappa + n$, contrary to our hypothesis about the partition function f. Thus $|F| < \lambda$.

From the maximality of F it follows that if $N \in T'$ and $\pi(N) \notin F$ then there is a finite set $y_N \subseteq F$ such that $\bigcap\{\, g(\beta) : \beta \in y_N \,\} - f_0(\pi(N)) \in I(\alpha, \sigma)$. Since $|F| < \lambda$ there is y such that $T'' = \{\, N \in T' : y_N = y \,\}$ is stationary. For $N \in T''$ let $a_N = \bigcap\{\, g(\beta) : \beta \in y \,\} - f_0(\pi(N))$. By Lemma 4.8 there is $\beta_N \leq \alpha$ such that $\bar{x}(\beta_N) \cap \bigcap\{\, g(\beta) : \beta \in x \,\}$ has type $\kappa^{\xi+1}$ and $\bar{x}(\beta_N) \cap a_N$ has type $< \kappa^{\xi+1}$. There is stationary $T''' \subseteq T''$ and β such that $T''' = \{\, N \in T'' : \beta_N = \beta \,\}$.

By thinning out T''' we may assume without loss of generality that each a_N for $N \in T'''$ is such that $a_N \subseteq (\bar{x}(\beta) \cap \zeta) \cup b_N$ where $\zeta < \sup \bar{x}(\beta)$ and b_N has type κ^η for some $\eta \leq \xi$, and that η and ζ are the same for all N. Now it follows from Corollary 4.3 that $T''' = \bigcup\{\, T_\delta : \delta < \kappa \,\}$ where for each δ, $\bigcup\{\, a_N : N \in T_\delta \,\}$ has type $< \kappa^{\xi+1}$. Pick such δ for which T_δ is stationary. Let $U = T_\delta$ and let $x = \bar{x}(\beta) \cap \bigcap\{\, g(\beta) : \beta \in y \,\} - \bigcup\{\, a_N : N \in T_\delta \,\}$. Then x is 0-homogeneous of type $\kappa^{\xi+1}$ and $\forall \alpha \in x \ \forall \beta \in \pi(U) \ f\{\alpha, \beta\} = 0$.

This completes the proof of Claim 4.4(b) for $\xi + 1$ from Claim 4.4(a) for ξ, provided $\xi \leq \omega$.

To complete the proof of Claim 4.4, and hence Theorem 4.1, let us observe that 4.4(a) for $\xi = \omega$ follows from 4.4(a) for $\xi < \omega$. Let C_n be a closed unbounded set as in 4.4(a) for $\xi = n$, and let $C = \bigcap\{\, C_n : n < \omega \,\}$. Let $N \in C \cap T$, $A \in N$, and $\pi(N) \in A$. By induction on n choose $x_n \in N$ as follows. Let x_0 be as in 4.4(a) for $\xi = 0$. Given x_m for $m < n$, let

$$A_n = \{\, \beta : \bigcup\{\, x_m : m < n \,\} \cup \{\beta\} \text{ is 0-homogeneous} \,\}.$$

Then $A_n \in N$ and $\pi(N) \in A$, so we may find $x_n \in N$ as in 4.4(a) with A replaced by A_n. But now $x = \bigcup\{\, x_n : n < \omega \,\} \in N$ and satisfies 4.4(a) with $\xi = \omega$.

5. An extension of the Erdős-Rado Theorem to ordinals. In this section we prove a theorem implying that if CH holds then for any $n < \omega$ there is $m < \omega$ such that $\omega_2 \cdot m \to (\omega_1 \cdot n)^2_2$. This is an improvement of a result of Shelah [Sh2] that implies under similar circumstances $\omega_2^m \to (\omega_1 \cdot n)^2_2$.

Let A be a set and let $k < \omega$. A *set-mapping* on A of order k is a function $p : A \to [A]^{<k}$ such that $a \notin p(a)$ for all $a \in A$. Given such a mapping p, a set $F \subseteq A$ is said to be *free* for p if $\forall a, b \in F \ a \notin p(b)$. It is well-known that if $n, k < \omega$ then there is $g(n,k) < \omega$ such that any set-mapping on $g(n,k)$ of order k has a free set of cardinality n. (This is easy to see using elementary Ramsey theory, for example.)

Let $n, k < \omega$.

We define $f(n,k)$ by induction on k. Let $f(n,0) = 1$, and let $f(n,k{+}1) = g(n, f(n,k))$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let κ be regular and let $\lambda = (2^{<\kappa})^+$. Then for all $n, k < \omega$ we have*

$$\lambda \cdot f(n,k) \to (\kappa \cdot n, \kappa \cdot (k+1))^2.$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on k. If $k = 0$ then $f(n, k) = 1$ so we must show $\lambda \to (\kappa \cdot n, \kappa)^2$, and this follows easily from Theorem 2.3, which implies $\lambda \to (\lambda, \kappa)^2$.

So we may assume $k > 0$. Let $m = f(n, k)$, and suppose $h : [m \times \lambda]^2 \to 2$. Note that with the lexicographic order, $m \times \lambda$ has order type $\lambda \cdot m$.

Choose $N_0 \prec N_1 \prec \cdots \prec N_{m-1} \prec H(\lambda^+)$ such that $N_i \in N_{i+1}$, $|N_i| = 2^{<\kappa}$, $N_i \cap \lambda \in \lambda$, and $[N_i]^{<\kappa} \subseteq N_i$ for all i. For each i let $\beta_i = N_i \cap \lambda$.

Let $A_i = \{i\} \times \lambda$. Without loss of generality we may assume that for each i there is n_i such that A_i contains no 1-homogeneous set of type $\kappa \cdot (n_i + 1)$ but for all $B \subseteq A_i$, if $|B| = \lambda$ then B contains a 1-homogeneous set of type $\kappa \cdot n_i$. Of course if $n_i \geq k + 1$ we are done, so we may assume $n_i \leq k$ for each i.

By induction on $\xi < \kappa$ we will define $a_{i\xi} \in A_i \cap N_0$ for each $i < m$, and we will obtain a set-mapping g_ξ on m.

Fix i, and let $X(i, \xi) = \{ a \in A_i : \forall \eta < \xi \ \forall j < m \ f\{a, a_{j\eta}\} = f\{(i, \beta_i), a_{j\eta}\} \}$. Since each $a_{j\eta} \in N_0$ and $[N_0]^{<\kappa} \subseteq N_0$, we have $X(i, \xi) \in N_0$ (note that the function assinging $a_{j\eta}$ to $f\{(i, \beta_i), a_{j\eta}\}$ must be in N_0). Since $(i, \beta_i) \in X(i, \xi)$ it is clear that $|X(i, \xi)| = \lambda$.

Now by $\lambda \to (\lambda, \kappa)^2$ we may assume $X(i, \xi)$ contains a 1-homogeneous set Y of order type κ (so $n_i \geq 1$ also), and we may assume $Y \in N_0$ since $N_0 \prec H(\lambda^+)$ and the statement that such a Y exists is true in $H(\lambda^+)$. If $Y \in N_0$, then in particular $Y \subseteq N_0$ as well.

We define $Y = Y_0 \supseteq Y_1 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq Y_m$ with $|Y_j| = \kappa$, as follows. Given Y_j, let $Y_{j+1} = \{ y \in Y_j : f\{(j, \beta_j), y\} = 0 \}$ if this set has cardinality κ; otherwise set $Y_{j+1} = Y_j$ and put $j \in g_\xi(i)$. Finally, choose $a_{i\xi} \in Y_m$. Note that $a_{i\xi} \in N_0$.

For the following lemmas let us assume for convenience that Theorem 5.1 is false for k.

Lemma 5.2. *$i \notin g_\xi(i)$.*

Proof. Suppose $i \in g_\xi(i)$. Let $C = \{ y \in Y_i : f\{(i, \beta_i), y\} = 0 \}$. Since $|C| < \kappa$ we have $C \in [N_0]^{<\kappa} \subseteq N_0$. Now (i, β_i) belongs to $Z = \{ b \in A_i : \forall y \in Y_i - C \ f\{b, y\} = 1 \}$. But $Y_i \in N_i$ since it is defined using Y and the β_j for $j < i$ and all these belong to N_i. Thus $Z \in N_i$ and since $(i, \beta_i) \in Z$ we must have $|Z| = \lambda$. By our hypothesis on n_i there is $B \subseteq Z$, 1-homogeneous of type $\kappa \cdot n_i$, and we may assume $\min B > \max Y_i$. But now $(Y_i - C) \cup B$ is 1-homogeneous of type $\kappa \cdot (n_i + 1)$, contradiction. Hence $i \notin g_\xi(i)$.

Lemma 5.3. $|g_\xi(i)| < f(n, k-1)$.

Proof. Again, suppose otherwise. For each $j \in g_\xi(i)$, choose a set $C_j \in [Y_j]^{<\kappa}$ such that $(j, \beta_j) \in Z_j = \{\, b \in A_j : \forall y \in Y_j - C_j \ f\{b, y\} = 1 \,\}$. Then $Z_j \in N_j$, and $|Z_j| = \lambda$.

By the inductive hypothesis for Theorem 5.1 we know $\lambda \cdot f(n, k-1) \to (\kappa \cdot n, \kappa \cdot k)^2$. If we apply this to $\bigcup\{\, Z_j : j \in g_\xi(i) \,\}$, which has order type $\geq \lambda \cdot f(n, k-1)$, either this set contains a 0-homogeneous set of type $\kappa \cdot n$ (in which case we have established Theorem 5.1) or else it contains a 1-homogeneous set B of type $\kappa \cdot k$. But then $B \cup Y_m - \bigcup\{\, C_j : j \in g_\xi(i) \,\}$ is 1-homogeneous of type $\kappa \cdot (k+1)$ and again we are done. Thus $|g_\xi(i)| < f(n, k-1)$.

Since there are only finitely many possibilities for g_ξ we may assume that they are all the same. Say $g_\xi = g$ for all $\xi < \kappa$. By the definition of $m = f(n, k)$ and Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 we know there is a free set F for g of cardinality n.

Lemma 5.4. *If $\xi \neq \eta$ and $j_1, j_2 \in F$ then $f\{a_{j_1\xi}, a_{j_2\eta}\} = 0$.*

Proof. Assume $\xi < \eta$, $i = j_1$, $j = j_2$. Since $j \notin g(i)$ we must have had $a_{i\xi} \in Y_m \subseteq Y_{j+1} = \{\, y \in Y_j : f\{(j, \beta_j), y\} = 0 \,\}$ during the choice of $a_{i\xi}$. Hence $f\{(j, \beta_j), a_{i\xi}\} = 0$, so necessarily $f\{a_{j\eta}, a_{i\xi}\} = 0$ also.

And now if $F = \{i_0, \ldots, i_{n-1}\}$ and $X_0, \ldots, X_{n-1}$ are disjoint subsets of κ, each of cardinality κ, then $\{\, a_{i_l\xi} : l < n \text{ and } \xi \in X_l \,\}$ is 0-homogeneous of type $\kappa \cdot n$. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.1.

Corollary 5.5. *$\lambda \cdot \omega \to (\kappa \cdot n)^2_2$ for all $n < \omega$.*

It is natural to ask whether the subscript in Theorem 5.1 can be improved. By Theorem 3.1 we know that if $\rho < \log \kappa$ then $\lambda \to (\kappa + \rho)^2_3$. If $\log \kappa < \kappa$ then a κ-closed forcing construction yields the consistency of $\lambda \not\to (\kappa + \log \kappa)^2_2$ as in [Pr] (and we may arrange $2^\kappa > \lambda$ as well), and Corollary 5.5 shows $\lambda^+ \to (\kappa \cdot n)^2_2$ for all $n < \omega$. What about $\lambda^+ \to (\kappa + \log \kappa)^2_3$? No ordinal below λ^+ will work in view of the following. Throughout, we assume κ is regular and $\lambda = (2^{<\kappa})^+$.

Proposition 5.6. *If $\lambda \not\to (\kappa + \log \kappa)^2_2$ then $\forall \alpha < \lambda^+ \ \alpha \not\to (\kappa + \log \kappa, \kappa + \log \kappa, \omega)^2$.*

Proof. Suppose $f : [\lambda]^2 \to 2$ witnesses $\lambda \not\to (\kappa + \log \kappa)^2_2$. Define $g : [\alpha]^2 \to 3$ as follows. Let $\pi : \alpha \to \lambda$ be a bijection (we assume $\lambda \leq \alpha < \lambda^+$). If $\xi < \eta < \alpha$ then let

$g\{\xi,\eta\} = 2$ if $\pi(\xi) > \pi(\eta)$ and let $g\{\xi,\eta\} = f\{\pi(\xi),\pi(\eta)\}$ otherwise. It is easy to see that this works.

Proposition 5.7. $\lambda^+ \rightarrow (\kappa \cdot n, \kappa \cdot n, \kappa + 1)^2$ *for all* $n < \omega$.

Proof. A proof exactly similar to Theorem 2.3 shows that $\lambda^+ \rightarrow (\lambda^+, \kappa + 1)^2$. Thus if $f : [\lambda^+]^2 \rightarrow 3$, either there is a 2-homogeneous set of type $\kappa + 1$ or else there is a set X of cardinality λ^+ such that $f``[X]^2 \subseteq \{0,1\}$. And now in the latter case Theorem 5.1 may be applied to find a subset of X homogeneous of type $\kappa \cdot n$.

Question. Does $\lambda^+ \rightarrow (\kappa + \log\kappa, \kappa + \log\kappa, \kappa + 2)^2$?

Assuming CH, the simplest nontrivial case is $\omega_3 \rightarrow (\omega_1 + \omega,\ \omega_1 + \omega,\ \omega_1 + 2)^2$ (and $2^{\omega_1} \geq \omega_3$).

References

[Ba] J. Baumgartner, *Iterated forcing*, **Surveys in Set Theory**, A. R. D. Mathias, ed., **London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series 87** (1983), 1–59.

[BH] J. Baumgartner and A. Hajnal, *A proof (involving Martin's Axiom) of a partition relation*, **Fund. Math. 78** (1973),193–203.

[DM] B. Dushnik and E. W. Miller, *Partially ordered sets*, **Amer. J. of Math. 63** (1941), 605.

[ER] P. Erdős and R. Rado, *A partition calculus in set theory*, **Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 62** (1956), 427–489.

[EHMR] P. Erdős, A. Hajnal, A. Máté and R. Rado, **Combinatorial Set Theory: Partition Relations for Cardinals**, North-Holland, 1984.

[Ha] A. Hajnal, *Some results and problems in set theory*, **Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung. 11** (1960), 277–298.

[Pr] K. Prikry, *On a problem of Erdős, Hajnal and Rado*, **Discrete Math. 2** (1972), 51–59.

[Sh1] S. Shelah, *Notes on combinatorial set theory*, **Israel J. Math. 14** (1973), 262–277.

[Sh2] S. Shelah, *On CH + $2^{\aleph_1} \to (\alpha)^2_2$ for $\alpha < \omega_2$*, to appear.

Dartmouth College
Hanover, NH 03755 USA

Mathematical Institute
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Budapest, Hungary

Institute Of Mathematics
Serbian Academy of Sciences
Belgrade, Yugoslavia